

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 4, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form. The remaining claims are dependent on claim 8. This amendment raises no new issues and entry is proper after final rejection.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by Sennett in view Busey in further view of Dusse.

Claim 8 recites "searching for an answer to the user problem stated by the user input; and displaying the answer to the user, wherein the computer program further performs the step of changing features of the radiotelephone." The Examiner acknowledged that Sennett and Busey fail to teach this features, and cites Dusse as teaching this feature. Applicant submits that the combination of Sennett, Busey and Dusse fails to teach all the elements of claim 8. Sennett is directed to providing a help guide to a user so that the user can retrieve instructions on how to use certain mobile phone features. The user can dial a help number and receive instructions on how to perform certain features. Thus, the "problem" addressed in Sennett is the user's inability to remember how to perform certain functions.

Dusse was relied upon for teaching changing features of a radiotelephone. Dusse is directed to provisioning services for a mobile phone and changing provisioned services if desired by the user. There is no discussion in Dusse of altering provisioned services in response to a user problem of the nature addressed in Sennett. The logical combination of Sennett and Dusse would be to use the Dusse system to provision services and the Sennett system to provide a help function once the services are provisioned. This combination of Sennett and Dusse does not, however, teach or suggest processing a user problem and changing features of the radiotelephone based on the problem. Dusse does not address the problem of Sennett, namely providing a user with a help guide to use functions. Rather, Dusse is directed to establishing the functions. Thus, the combination of Sennett, Busey and Dusse fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 8 where a user

problem is received, answered, and the radiotelephone features changed in a single process.

For at least the above reasons, claim 8 is patentable over Sennett, Busey and Dusse. Claims 2-7 and 9 depend from claim 8 and are patentable over Sennett, Busey and Dusse for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 8.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys:

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: March 7, 2005